WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

January 27, 2004

TO:	Internal File
THRU:	Daron Haddock, Permit Supervisor
FROM:	David Darby, Senior Reclamation Specialist
RE:	2003 Second Quarter Water Monitoring, Consolidation Coal Company, Emery Deep Mine, C/015/0015-WQ03-2, Task ID #1825
	submitted for all of the MRP required sites? YES [] NO [X] sty sites not monitored and reason why, if known:
	mation for this report was evaluated from file; 0:\015015.eme\Water check012304.xls.
stream data w Bryant, EMR	ne 2nd quarter, all spring data was submitted. No UPDES data was submitted. Most was not submitted. Water levels and water quality data was not submitted for wells IA 1,TP-U and USGS1-2, and no monitoring data was submitted for ZZ-L. No was submitted.
2. On what	date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.
	echnical Directive 004 for baseline resampling requirements. Consider the five-resubmittal when responding to question one above. Indicate if the MRP does not equirement.
Resampling	due date
Plan	does not specify.
	required parameters reported for each site? YES [] NO [X] nents, including identity of monitoring site:
	stream data was not submitted. Water Level and water quality data was not wells TP-U and USGS1-2 Bryant and EMRIA 1, and no monitoring data was

submitted for ZZ-L. No UPDES data was submitted. Spring data was okay.

Page 2 C/015/0015-WQ03-2 Task ID #1825 January 27, 2004

4. Were irregularities found in the da	ata	d	the	in 1	d i	found	larities	irregu	Were	4.
--	-----	---	-----	------	-----	-------	----------	--------	------	----

YES[X] NO[]

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

Some sites showed constituents several standard deviations away from normal (see 2 yr snapshot). These irregularities could be related to the exceptional dry weather or water samples are getting mixed up.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

Identify sites and months not monitored:

1 st month,	YES [X]	NO[]
2 nd month,	YES[]	NO [X]
3 rd month,	YES[]	NO [X]

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?

YES [] NO [X]

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?

YES[X] NO[]

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

None submitted.

8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

I have sent a copy of the data file to Steve Demczak and James Byars so they know what data is missing and hopefully submit it to the database. The data that is missing in the data file is identified by red highlighted areas of the table where the data should be.

The operator should take a close look at the data to determine why the standard deviations are so far off.

O:\015015.EME\Water Quality\dwdWQ03-2 1825.doc